

believe she deserves the support of our colleagues.

In a letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Fraternal Order of Police described Ms. Gupta as one who “always worked with us to find common ground, even when that seemed impossible.” So it is clear that she has the support of police. So we need someone like her who is going to bring back this important role of oversight to these important issues.

Ms. Clarke is the same. She is nominated to head the Civil Rights Division where she once worked as a trial lawyer. She previously codirected the voting rights work of the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, led the Civil Rights Bureau in the New York State Attorney General's office, and has served as the president of the Lawyers Committee on Civil Rights Under the Law. I have called her; I have interviewed her. Why? Because I am tired of the violence and hate crimes in the State of Washington. I am tired of hearing, time and time again, about these issues. And it can be the synagogue in Spokane, where literally somebody spray-painted it. And you would think, Well, how are we going to find who spray-painted a swastika on a synagogue in Spokane? You think, How are we going to find that person? Okay. Not a lot of trouble because people actually said, We did it purposely because we are an organization who believes in this, and we wanted to get our message out. That is what we're facing.

And several years ago, we found a bomb planted in the Martin Luther King Day Parade in Spokane, just a few years ago. So these aren't issues that we are sending somebody over to the Department of Justice to analyze and write a report on. We are asking people to help us with the situation in the United States of America to fight hate crimes and to bring about justice on the civil rights and civil liberties of all Americans. And so we have to have people that we have confidence that they are going to uphold our laws and enforce them.

We need to have consent decrees to hold police departments accountable for systematic violations of constitutional rights. We need to defend voting rights and to make sure that hate crimes against Asian-American and Pacific Islanders are prosecuted. And so this is why the nomination of Ms. Clarke is so important. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if you are facing any of this in your State, please get Kristen Clarke to be there to help us address these issues.

Advocating for increased investment in mental health and social work and school resources for minority communities is something that law enforcement agrees with. They agree that we should do these things. So that is not defunding the police; yet people accuse Kristen Clarke of the same thing. She must be for defunding the police. I have talked to prosecutors throughout the State of Washington, and they will tell

me that these programs that help families and communities identify these problems early are actually the best things to keep them from having to really have problems later. I certainly hope that some of the false claims that people have made about Ms. Clarke being anti-police are also continued to be struck down as untrue.

Ms. Clarke understands law enforcement must collaborate with the State, local, and Federal level. She has a solid record of working cooperatively with law enforcement for decades. She is supported by the Major Cities Chief Association, the National Association of Black Law Executives, a bipartisan group of over 70 former State attorneys general, and more than 40 police chiefs and sheriffs throughout the United States. That can't be somebody who sounds anti-law enforcement. They have the support of law enforcement.

What we need is the support of our colleagues to say that these are serious issues and the Federal Government does play a role. That is why it is called the Department of Justice, and that is why they oversee and make sure that the civil liberties of all Americans are upheld. As attorney general and at the Lawyers Committee, Ms. Clarke played a key role in launching a Religious Rights Initiative to address faith-based discrimination to fight anti-Semitic activities. When Ms. Clarke led the Lawyers Committee, she led the charge in shutting down abhorrent anti-Semitic websites that made racist comments, and some were in connection with stormfront.org, which was a central site used to organize the 2017 Unite the Right rally in Charlottesville.

She recognized that online hate is an emerging threat and that Congress must address that threat. After seeing what happened on January 6 and the plethora of anti-Semitic paraphernalia presented here even in the Capitol as we saw riots, Ms. Clarke's expertise and dedication to fighting online hate would be extremely beneficial to the Department and to all Americans.

So I implore my colleagues, these are strong women, great qualifications, have been in the mix on these policy issues for a long time. They know what we are up against. We have to ask ourselves, Are we going to enforce the law? These women will enforce the law, and they have the support of law enforcement. We should proceed and confirm both of them.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume executive session in consideration of the Gensler nomination.

All time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gensler nomination?

Ms. CANTWELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 157 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Rounds
Brown	Kelly	Sanders
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Lujan	Sinema
Collins	Lummis	Smith
Coons	Manchin	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Markey	Tester
Duckworth	Menendez	Van Hollen
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Feinstein	Murphy	Warnock
Gillibrand	Murray	Warren
Grassley	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hassan	Padilla	Wyden

NAYS—45

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Tuberville
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Burr

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lisa O. Monaco, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Monaco nomination?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 158 Ex.]

YEAS—98

Baldwin	Bennet	Blumenthal
Barrasso	Blackburn	Blunt

Booker	Hickenlooper	Risch
Boozman	Hirono	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rosen
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Cantwell	Johnson	Sanders
Capito	Kaine	Sasse
Cardin	Kelly	Schatz
Carper	Kennedy	Schumer
Casey	King	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Scott (SC)
Collins	Lankford	Shaheen
Coons	Leahy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lee	Sinema
Cortez Masto	Lujan	Smith
Cotton	Lummis	Stabenow
Cramer	Manchin	Sullivan
Crapo	Markey	Tester
Daines	Marshall	Thune
Duckworth	McConnell	Tillis
Durbin	Menendez	Toomey
Ernst	Merkley	Tuberville
Feinstein	Moran	Van Hollen
Fischer	Murkowski	Warner
Gillibrand	Murphy	Warnock
Graham	Murray	Warren
Grassley	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Hagerty	Padilla	Wicker
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Hawley	Portman	Young
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—2

Cruz Paul

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table. The President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

COVID-19 HATE CRIMES ACT—
Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session. The Senator from Oklahoma.

DEFENSE BUDGET

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, last week—no, it wasn't last week; it was about 3 weeks ago, I guess, now, President Biden released his "skinny budget," which gave us a top-line for defense of \$715 billion. This is a reduction, and I want to make sure everyone understands this because the cut is actually below inflation, and that is not where we are supposed to be.

You know, we have this document here that everyone agrees with. I don't know one person—and this was written by six Democrats, six Republicans, and this was in 2018. This has been used as our blueprint ever since that time, and it is just remarkable the way it has come out. The recommendations on this, as I said, were made by six Republicans, six Democrats. All of them were experts in the field of defense, and they came out with recommendations. In this year, the amount in the budget for our military is supposed to be between 3 and 5 percent. This is in the document in front of us here. Of course, this is actually a reduction. So it is way below what has been prescribed.

When it comes to China, there are two big reasons we need to make sure our budget matches our strategy. First of all, China is spending more on their military than ever before. As a result,

they are getting more technologically advanced and starting to sway the military balance of power in their favor. There is no question about it, and I will document that in a minute.

The threat the Chinese military poses is not a distant threat. It is not something that might happen in 2030, 2035, or sometime in the future. It is a problem we face today, right now, and it only gets worse over time.

Admiral Davidson told the Armed Services Committee that he expects the threat to manifest "this decade, in fact, in the next six years." That is the sense of urgency. That is when they become greater than we are in many areas of defense and aggression.

So today I would like to spend some time dealing with the Chinese military and what they are doing. This is what we are up against. This is why it is so important that we get our defense budget right.

Let's start with China's military budget. Since 2000, Beijing's spending on the People's Liberation Army has gone up 450 percent—450 percent. Now, we knew that back during the Obama administration, that actually went up. Our reduction—it was a reduction in the last 5 years—was 25 percent. At the same time, China went up by 83 percent. So this is what is going on in the world today. Beijing's budget for the military went up 450 percent.

Now, you compare Beijing's buildup with the rest of East Asia. At the same time, our core allies and partners in the region—that is, Japan, Australia, South Korea, and Taiwan—have had basically flat defense budgets since 2000. Compare it with our own military spending. As I mentioned on the floor a couple of weeks ago, at the same time China was adding \$200 billion to their defense budget, ours shrunk by \$400 billion.

We are certainly not provoking them with defense investment, and we have barely touched our force posture in the Western Pacific over the past two decades. So, if anything, our lack of action, our lack of investment, is what is provoking China into thinking they can push around and threaten our friends in the region.

The Biden administration says they want to take our allies and partners seriously. So we should listen when they say they are concerned about Chinese aggression. And they are, and the administration knows this. I have had visits with the President. He is fully aware of that.

Another progressive talking point is that the United States spends more on defense than the next 10 or 12 countries combined. Now, that is not true. The reality is that any honest comparison of numbers shows that, combined, the Chinese and Russians almost certainly spend more than us in real terms.

China's purchasing power is significantly greater than ours because they pay their workers next to nothing and have much lower material costs. They also focus their defense spending on

hard power. I am talking about air-planes, tanks, ships, missiles, and the like. Why? Because they don't take care of their people.

People don't understand this. At least 40 percent of our military budget goes to supporting our people. That is not true with any of the Communist countries that are out there. All they do, they give them the guns and say go out and kill people. We don't do that. And 40 percent is a conservative figure.

You remember the housing issue that was such a big issue; that you were concerned with; I was concerned with; we were all concerned with. That is something that other countries don't have to worry about. China doesn't worry about that. Russia doesn't worry about that. These are things that—and yet that is almost half of our total budget goes to those things for our troops.

We take care of our troops. The rest of them don't. That is the right thing to do. But that is just another reason you can't do a dollar-for-dollar comparison between the Chinese and the defense spending. We need a better accounting.

And incidentally, Senator ROMNEY introduced an amendment to our last year's NDAA, military defense act, to get us a real comparison in spending. And the Pentagon owes us that report by October.

Now, in October—we are going to talk about this. We are going to talk about this in our military because this is what the real spending is, not what a lot of people think that it is. All of this is to say, we don't have a good sense of China's true defense spending, but we do know it is going up.

General McMaster called it "the largest peacetime military buildup in history." That is what General McMaster said just the other day at one of our hearings. It is not just expanding their military; they are modernizing and professionalizing at the same time.

Secretary Austin, our Secretary of Defense, rightfully, calls China our "pacing threat." But here are a few of the ways that they have been outpacing us because they are investing where we are not investing. The American people think we are, but we are not.

China has a 355-ship Navy. You know, we have been talking about that for a long period of time here—how we are going to grow to a 350-ship Navy, and we haven't done it. Well, China has done it. They have achieved that last year. And while we were just talking about it, they were on the attack to get 460 ships by 2030.

By comparison, our Navy is around 300 ships, and it is likely to stay there if our defense budget doesn't grow.

In the air, the combatant commanders assess that China will have more fifth-generation aircraft than we do in the Pacific by 2025, again, the fifth-generation aircraft. We are down right now to the F-35. There are not